



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SHEBNA AND ELIAKIM

PROFESSOR EDUARD KOENIG, PH.D., D.D.
Bonn, Germany

In the last volume of the *American Journal of Theology* (pp. 621-42) Professor Kemper Fullerton has published "A New Chapter out of the Life of Isaiah." Commentaries on the article were inevitable. They would certainly have appeared even if this new chapter from the biography of Isaiah had been drawn in strokes less bold; and I feel that I have the first right to comment on it, because, as author of the article "Shebna" in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I am probably the most recent predecessor of Professor Fullerton. But my readers must not be frightened by this announcement, as if my commentary on the chapter threatened to be longer than the chapter itself. I shall endeavor to exercise the right of commenting as sparingly as possible, and for this reason, if for no other, I shall follow Professor Fullerton's exposition point by point.

I. In regard to Isa. 22:15-18, in which Shebna, on account of his arrogance, is threatened by the prophet with the loss of his office as major domo, I agree almost completely with Professor Fullerton (pp. 622 f.), except that the word "this" in the command of God, "Go, get thee unto this treasurer" (vs. 15b) cannot "suggest that the personality of the official was well known." This significance would be probable if the command had been addressed to some obscure man of the people. But it was addressed to Isaiah, and to him the personality of the major domo was known as a matter of course. In his case it would have been natural for the sentence to read: "Get thee to *the* treasurer." Consequently the demonstrative pronoun "this" rather has the function here of pointing toward a contemptible personage. It has this meaning in quite a number of passages, which are enumerated in my *Syntax*, § 48. The arrogant character of Shebna is also probably expressed by the choice of the phrase *ha-sôkhên*,¹ for סֹכֶן in the Phoenician means

¹ Compare *ha-sokheneth* Abishag of Shunem (I Kings 1:2).

"to care for, to administer,"² and *sakânu* in the Tell-el-Amarna letters has the sense of "to care for."³ If *sôkhên* had been "a general title" (Fullerton, p. 622), it would probably occur more frequently. Furthermore, Professor Fullerton has not by any arguments disproved that Shebna was "a member of the pro-Egyptian party" (p. 623, n. 6). This conjecture is rather suggested by the figure of speech in which Isaiah expressed the threat against Shebna: that Jehovah would toss him like a ball into a land which would not have narrow valleys like Canaan, but would be "wide in both directions;" that is to say, into the broad plains along the Euphrates and Tigris. Now, if Shebna favored the political alliance of the kingdoms of Judah and Egypt (see Isa., chaps. 30 f.), it would be very natural that he should be taken prisoner during some invasion of the Assyrians as one of their opponents, and that he should be deported to the countries of the East. I may say, in passing, that the idea that Shebna was a foreigner who possibly had been brought from Damascus by Ahaz (cf. II Kings 16:10 ff.; Isa. 2:6) may be indicated by the נ in שִׁבְנָא. This is strongly supported by Arnold B. Ehrlich in *Mikrâ ki-Pheschûtô*, Part III, "Die Propheten" (1901), p. 44: אֵין לוֹ בֵּית אֵב בִּישְׂרָאֵל. גַּבְרָ (22:17a; Peshitta, *gabrâ*) also occurs nowhere else in the Book of Isaiah.

II. Passing to the section Isa. 22:19-23, which announces to Eliakim that he is to succeed Shebna in the office of major domo, I would say, in the first place, that Professor Fullerton has not put the correct interpretation on the transition from the third person to the first. He simply asserts: "There is nothing to explain this sudden change of persons" (p. 624). But that is hardly the state of the case. The transition from the third person to the first occurs rather frequently, as Professor Fullerton might have discovered if he had consulted my *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik*; on pp. 248 ff. this very usage is discussed. We have a perfectly analogous case in the words in Deut. 29:3 f.: "But Jehovah hath not given you a heart to know . . . and I have led you forty years in the Wilderness;" also in Isa. 3:1a and 4a: "For behold the Lord Jehovah of hosts

² Bloch, *Phoenisisches Glossar*, *sub voce*.

³ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, Vol. V, Brief 105, l. 3: *tiskin*, "thou carest;" Brief 105, 34, 38: *liskin*, "may he care."

doth take away . . . and I will give children to be their princes, etc.”⁴ There are even parallels for a further return from the first to the third person, as my collection, pp. 253 ff., will show. On the other hand, of course, it is possible that an original **אֶהְרֹסְךָ**, “I shall pull thee down,” was changed by some mechanical copyist into **יֶהְרֹסְךָ**, “he will pull thee down,” on account of the third person singular which follows immediately afterward. But that is not a fact of much importance. The main thing is that the sentence, “And I will thrust thee from thine office” (vs. 19a) need not, as Professor Fullerton thinks (p. 624), be regarded as the beginning of a new section on account of the change to the first person (p. 624).

III. As soon as we reach vss. 24 f., the question confronts us with tremendous emphasis whether these verses still refer to Eliakim. Professor Fullerton denies this with great decision (pp. 625 f.), but I venture to give several reasons why the question may be answered in the affirmative. Here are the reasons: (1) The Waw which begins vs. 24 may be simply the equivalent of an adversative conjunction—a usage which is not infrequent in Hebrew and in other languages (compare, for instance, *w^{lo}*, Isa. 30:15 ff., “but not”). (2) A conditional sentence can do without its introductory conjunction in this passage, just as in many others.

For instance, in Jer. 20:9a the word **וְאִם־יֹאמַרְי** is translated “and I said” or “and if I said.” I would also call attention to such cases as Jer. 22:15, **וַיַּעַשׂה**. The words “and did justice” here are followed by **אָז**, which introduces the sentence “then it was well with him.” Consequently the word **וַיַּעַשׂה** means: “and *if* he exercised justice.” It follows that the beginning of Isa. 22:24 may have this meaning: “And yet (or, However), the whole weight of his father’s house shall hang upon him,⁵ . . . and then,” etc. (vs. 25). (3) Most of the expressions of vs. 24 are probably to be taken ironically. (4) The intention may have been to warn Eliakim’s family,

⁴ For the other cases see my *Stilistik*, pp. 249 ff. Condamin, too, has failed to take note of them. In his *Le livre d’Isaïe* (1905), p. 152, he simply orders us: “Lire **הַדְפַּחְךָ**, au lieu de **הַדְפַּחְךָ**.”

⁵ *Kabôd* is used in a double sense, like *derekh* in 10:24b, etc. (Cf. my *Stilistik*, etc., p. 11.) It is possible, however, that in the original orthography the second **כְּבוֹד** may have been **כִּבְדָּר**, and that it meant *Kôbed*, which occurs in Isa. 21:15 and 30:27, but nowhere else except in Nah. 3:3 and Prov. 27:3.

or even Eliakim himself, not to exploit the influential position of their relative. (5) The phrase "in that day" (vs. 25) may mean "in that time" or "then," for יום has the more general sense of "time," for instance in Jer. 7:22, etc. In that case this *bajjôm* may be practically equivalent to the יום in Jer. 22:15, to which reference has been made; that is to say, it may indicate the beginning of the apodosis of a conditional sentence.⁶ (6) The decisive point is this, that the expressions used in vs. 25 so manifestly refer back to vss. 23 f. that they must refer also to the same person with whom vs. 23 deals, namely to Eliakim. Consequently the paraphrase of the Targum on vs. 25^b is quite correct: "And the saying of the prophesy concerning him will cease," that is, will lose its validity.⁷ This view would not necessarily involve that the Old Testament must somewhere tell of the punishment of this Eliakim, for he and his family may have taken the warning. As a matter of fact, in all passages where this Eliakim is mentioned we find him still administering the same office as major domo (II Kings 18:18, 26, 37 and 19:2; Isa. 36:3, 11, 22 and 37:2). The final reason for arriving at this judgment concerning vss. 24 f. is that all other views taken of vss. 24 f. are, in my judgment, burdened with still greater difficulties.

IV. Of these other views I shall discuss first one which could not yet have been known to Professor Fullerton, and which seems to be the simplest. It is the view taken by Condamin in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (1905, pp. 153 f.), who asserts that vs. 25 is the only part of the passage added by a later interpolator. He seeks to prove this by pointing out that vss. 20-24, in form and sense, are an exact parallel to vss. 15-19.⁸ But this sample of strophe will hardly be convincing to anyone who is not already convinced that the Israelite prophets were fond of strophic construction,⁹ for the strophe

⁶ In my *Syntax*, § 390, *p q r*, a number of conditional sentences without the conjunction have been collected, running down to the Mishna. Cases of יום as the sign of the apodosis will be found § 415, *n*.

⁷ Targum on Isa. 22:25^b: וְהַנְּבִיאִים לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת הַנְּבִיאִים.

⁸ Condamin, *loc. cit.* p. 153: "20-24 est exactement, par la forme comme par le sens, la contre-partie de 15-19, l'antistrophe parallèle."

⁹ See on this point my *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik*, pp. 304 ff.

which Condamin tries to build up out of the sentences in vss 15-19 contains only twelve lines, and even then the mere fragment of a sentence, "into a large country" (vs. 18*a*), has to do duty as an entire sentence. On the other hand, Condamin himself has to recognize that there are fifteen lines in vss. 20-24. Condamin discovers a further important correspondence of form in the two sections in the fact that the words *kabod*, "glory, honor," and *bajith*, "house," occur both in vs. 18*b* and in vs. 24*a*. But in vs. 18*a* these two words have no connection with each other; in vs. 24*a* they have a different sense; and finally these two words are so common that their use could hardly be avoided. But the main point is that the words of vs. 24 manifestly carry a tinge of irony. That ironical sense crops out even in the choice of צפירות, "issue," that is, descendants of a less distinguished kind; also in the choice of the metaphor concerning the vessels. On that account, too, the word *kabod* (vs. 24*a*) has the sense here of "weight, burden"—unless, indeed, the original reading was *kóbed* (see note 5 above). Consequently the words of vs. 24 cannot be intended to describe the culmination of Eliakim's triumph. On the contrary, they must refer to a possible occurrence which, if it should happen, would be fatal to the position of Eliakim. It follows that vs. 24 is not connected with the preceding sentences, but forms a separate section with vs. 25.

V. Many expositors have thought they could remove the difficulty by assuming that vss. 24 and 25 once more refer to Shebna. The futility of this attempt has been set forth by Professor Fullerton (pp. 626 f.) almost exhaustively. I would add only two suggestions. It is characteristic of vs. 25 that several phrases refer back with great precision to phrases in vs. 23. Consequently vs. 25 itself must also refer to Eliakim. Furthermore, the judgment on the reprehensible character of Shebna had already been pronounced as a message of God (vss. 15-19). It would therefore have been superfluous to introduce this judgment once more with the phrase "Word of Jehovah."

VI. Finally, some expositors have felt that severer operations are necessary to remove the difficulties found in Isa. 22:15-25.

Duhm in the *Handkommentar*, and Marti in the *Kurzer Handkommentar*, think the riddle can be solved by treating not

only vss. 24 and 25, but also vss. 19-23, as later additions. Professor Fullerton has criticized this view (pp. 635 f.), but his criticism needs supplementing in several directions.

1. In the first place, vs. 24 f. is regarded by these expositors as a later addition, because it would be an act of "desperation" to treat vs. 24 as a conditional sentence (Marti). But vigorous expressions do not compensate us for lack of argument. It would have been more to the point if the question had been investigated how often in Hebrew and in other languages the conditional sentence is replaced by other constructions.¹⁰ Moreover, would not the interpolator who wrote vss. 24 and 25, according to Duhm and Marti, himself have intended to put a hypothetical meaning into vs. 24? Certainly, for it is inconceivable that the supposed interpolator, who had just spoken of the new major domo in the most honorable expressions in vss. 19-23, should now proceed in vs. 24 to accuse him positively of nepotism.

2. They think there are good reasons for assuming that the work of the interpolator began at vs. 19.

a) One reason for this assumption is drawn from the form, namely the transition from the third person to the first. But I must point out once more (see Section II above) that Isa. 3:1-4, for instance, is analogous in form with 22:17-19. In the former passage the construction runs: "Behold the Lord Jehovah of Hosts doth take away, . . . and I will give, . . . "; just as in 22:17-19 it runs: "Behold Jehovah will hurl . . . and I will thrust, . . . " Not even Marti concluded that the transition from the third person to the first in Isa. 3:4 indicated an interpolation. Consequently this transition in 22:19 cannot by itself constitute an argument for such an assumption. The question might even be raised whether an interpolator would have been likely to begin his work by creating such a dissimilarity in form. However, Marti discovers a second formal proof for the interpolated character of vs. 19 in the fact that "the officer who had already been hurled into exile in vss. 17 f. is only now to be removed from his position." Now, aside from the fact that the interpolator would have committed the same mistake in style, it is clear that the beginning of vs. 19 has the sense,

¹⁰ See my *Syntax*, § 390, q.

“and thus I will thrust thee from thine office.” This simply expresses in plain terms what had previously been expressed by metaphor,¹¹ and such a transition to the announcement about the successor of Shebna is not unnatural. There are no further arguments for the secondary origin of vss. 19–23 which might be drawn from the form of the construction. Or can it be claimed that only a later writer would speak of אֶבְנֵיט (Marti)? The terminology of the esoteric priestly¹² sections of the Pentateuch of course had its roots in the past. The ancient case ending \tilde{i} (vs. 16) would not necessarily appear again in vss. 19–23, because in general it occurs only very rarely.¹³ Moreover, there is no attached participle in vss. 19–23.

b) Those who deny that vss. 19–23 were written by Isaiah think that the contents of the section furnish additional grounds for their opinion. They say that it was not part of the prophet's office to appoint a new major domo. But the same scholars expressly admit that Isaiah had the right to announce to Shebna, a duly installed officer of the king, that he was to be exiled; and they justly judge so, for Amos did the same in regard to a priest of the royal sanctuary (Amos 7:16 f.), and Jeremiah did the same in regard to Passhur (20:6). Now, to depose a royal officer and to appoint another comes to the same thing as a question of right. Furthermore, we may assume (Isa. 37:2 ff.) that Isaiah was sure of the consent of King Hezekiah.

Finally, the representatives of this new view are unable to tell us from what source this saying about Eliakim was drawn, if it does not belong to Isaiah. Marti, indeed, suggests that someone identified the scribe Shebna of Isa. 36:3 with the evil officer of 22:15–18, and then assumed that the major domo Eliakim (36:3) had become his successor. But there is no occasion in 36:3 for drawing any such conclusion, for there is not the slightest indication in that passage that the scribe Shebna was a bad officer. If such conjectures were to be invented, it would have been wiser at least not to quote 36:3 in their support.

Thus the representatives of this opinion are unable to assign any

¹¹ We have the same phenomenon in style for instance in Isa. 1:6 f. and 22 f. See additional examples in my *Stilistik, etc.*, p. 157, 37 and 203, 23 f.

¹² See on this point my *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, pp. 225 ff.

¹³ See my *Syntax*, § 272.

satisfactory motive why any later author should have interpolated the passage concerning Eliakim, vss. 19-23. But possibly they have succeeded in discovering the cause for the other interpolation in vss. 24 f. Marti thinks (p. 177) that "it is not beyond the reach of possibility that this interpolation alludes to the death of the wicked high-priest Alcimus in the year 160 before Christ." He arrives at this conjecture by the fact that Josephus¹⁴ after the mention of Ἀλκιμος adds the words ὁ καὶ Ἰάκειμος κληθείς. He thinks that this name does not refer to Jakim (cf. Jahkin, Gen. 46:10 ff.), but to Jojakim, and that from the word "Alkimus" we may surmise that its original Hebrew form was "Eliakim." But suppose these conjectures were sure, was this Alkimus ever a high-priest who merited the commendation of God? After his first institution by Antiochus V Eupator¹⁵ he was expelled by those Jews who were faithful to the law, and later was again thrust out of his office by them. For this reason, if for no other, this Alkimus could not have been identified with the Eliakim of Isa. 22:20-23, quite aside from the fact that a highpriest and a major domo are two different things. It follows that a passage alluding to the rejection of Alkimus could not have been attached to 22:20-23. And, finally, what a grotesque assumption it is that men of the second century should try to secure a justification for the expulsion of Alkimus by interpolating a remark in the Book of Isaiah! Thus the defenders of the law who were opposed to Alkimus tried by falsification of the Scriptures to cement the base on which they proposed to take their stand!

VII. Finally Professor Fullerton applies entirely new machinery to shed full light on Isa. 22:15-25, and my chief concern is to examine the need and the value of this new light. I shall touch only indirectly on opinions which he shares with his predecessors or which are of inferior importance.

1. He finds a secondary basis for his entire construction of the passage in the claim that the words "unto Shebna, who is over the house" (that is, of the king) (vs. 15b), were interpolated by a later hand (p. 623). But this is by no means certain. (a) There are passages¹⁶ where שֹׁבְנָא and שֹׁבְנָא, etc., are parallel. I would also call

¹⁴ *Antiquities*, XII, ix, 7.

¹⁶ Cf. my *Syntax*, § 319.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, XII, ix, 7, and II Macc. 14:3 7.

attention to the parallelism of **לְנֶגְדְּ** and **עַל** in Isa. 2:2b and Mic. 4:1b, and to the same change of words in I Kings 16:7. (b) The expression *el ha-sôkhên ha-ze* would hardly have been sufficiently clear by itself. If anyone asserts the contrary, let him prove that *sôkhên* was an official title, and that the word *ha-ze* in this place does not necessarily have an ironical sense (see Section I above). Professor Fullerton thinks that "this view is opposed by the allusive character of the passage as a whole." But if these words of his contain any clear and possible thought at all, they do not exclude the ironical meaning of *ha-ze*. (c) The words in question could not possibly have been inferred from 36:3, and it is far more preferable to hold to these words as a correct designation of the object of the prophecy, vss. 15-18, than to assume that this prophecy is hung in the air without definite address. (d) We might even venture the extreme assertion that the words "against Shebna, the major domo," are more original than the preceding words, "Go, get thee unto this treasurer." The former phrase is more directly and closely attached to the sentence, "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah of hosts." Moreover, in that case we should no longer feel the lack of some verb of utterance before the following verse: "What doest thou here, etc." (Vs. 16a.) At any rate, I venture the conjecture that one cause for the change from **לְנֶגְדְּ** to **עַל** in vs. 15b was the desire to indicate that the sentence "against Shebna who is over the house" was to supplement the words, "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah of hosts."

2. One of the most important claims of Professor Fullerton is that vss. 20-23 in his judgment are intended to promise the royal office to Eliakim (pp. 629 f.). He asserts (a) that the word **מִמְשִׁלְתָּהּ** (vs. 21a) is not applicable to such an office as that of major domo. He cites the fact that in the Revised Version the word is nine times translated by "dominion," twice by "to rule," once (II Chron. 32:9) by "power," and only once, in Isa. 22:21, by "government." But all this does not do away with the fact that the word **מִמְשִׁלָּה** does also designate such a commanding position as the major domo in general necessarily occupied and such as the major domo Shebna—who according to the context is here addressed—occupied in particular. It is certainly a fact that the same word in Gen. 1:16

and in Ps. 136:8 f. expresses a merely secondary rule. It is still more important that Isa. 22:21a did not select the word מַמְלִכָּה, which would have meant royal rule. (b) A pious and capable major domo might well become a "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah." He could earn this title by impartial justice in his appointments for lower offices, and by wise benevolence toward the poor and oppressed, just like Job (29:11; cf. 31:18), and just as Joseph in a similar position is called a "father to Pharaoh" (Gen. 45:8). (c) It is very questionable if אֲבִיט signified only the girdle of a priest, and therefore necessarily refers to the priestly function which the kings occasionally exercised. (d) Thus these three points contain no positive argument for any royal dignity of Eliakim. On the other hand, his designation as the son of Hilkiah (vs. 20), and the sentence, "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder" (vs. 22), carry a far greater weight for the contrary argument. Thus, even if we should assume, with Professor Fullerton, that vss. 20-23 may be viewed by themselves, we should be unable to discover in them such significance as that the author of this section meant to offer the royal dignity to Eliakim.

3. It is a further important assertion of Professor Fullerton that 22:15-18 are later in time than chaps. 36 f. (pp. 632 f. and 637). He thinks that we are to conceive of Shebna as a man climbing from the inferior position of the scribe of the state (36:3 and 37:2) to the highest office in the land; or rather that Shebna, "the upstart and foreigner," had pushed his way into the position of Eliakim (p. 633). He thinks that from this point of view the indignation of Isaiah, which found expression in 22:15-18, was quite natural. But, in the first place, Professor Fullerton's expressions, "Isaiah's hostility to Shebna," and "the burning indignation of Isaiah expressed in our prophecy" (pp. 637 f.), are hyperbolic. In the second place, the threat against Shebna in 22:15-18 finds a sufficient explanation in the arrogance of Shebna, which is indicated in the double "here" (22:16a), and in other mistakes of Shebna which had merited the appellation "thou shame of thy Lord's house" (vs. 18b). If we thus find the cause for the prophetic condemnation in the encroachments of which Shebna had been guilty, we can stand by the text as the trustworthy basis for our judgment. If, on the other hand,

we propose to side with Professor Fullerton, how much do we have to add to the text 22:15-18! Perhaps the objection will be raised that, even if the occurrence in chaps. 36 f. succeeded that of 22:15-18, we still have to insert at least one assumption, namely, that the divine threat was actually fulfilled, though perhaps only in modified form, just as in Jer. 18:7-10. But such an insertion would be quite natural, because it would have clear motives and would be indicated by the text itself. On the other hand, if we sanction the sequence proposed by Professor Fullerton and assume that 22:15-18 succeeds chaps. 36 f. in time, it can be inferred neither from chaps. 36 f. nor from 22:15-18 that Shebna actually did force out Eliakim. In that case the indications which are really perceptible in the text (the double "here" and "thou shame," etc., vss. 16*a* and 18*b*) fail to receive the weight which they deserve, and we drift into the realm of baseless conjecture.

4. The final claim of Professor Fullerton is that 22:20-23 was the manifesto for a revolution by which Eliakim was to be raised to the throne against Manasseh (pp. 639 f.). But we were not able to concede (section 2 above) that the section quoted, even if viewed without regard to its present context, does contain the offer of the royal dignity to Eliakim. It is just as impossible to concede that this section can be inserted in the history of King Manasseh as the programme for an insurrection. We do not at all deny that a prophetic reaction against the anti-prophetic policy of this king would have been possible. Just as the prophet Elisha sent one of "the sons of the prophets" to anoint Jehu (II Kings 9:1), so a similar opposition movement might have been directed against Manasseh. But we do most decidedly doubt that such a movement of the prophets against Manasseh actually did take place. It is true that Manasseh "shed innocent blood till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another" (II Kings 21:16). But the guilt of the house of Ahab was certainly still greater. We must also consider the fact that revolutions were more frequent in the kingdom of Israel, and that the idea of dethroning the dynasty of David in Jerusalem was far more remote. A revolution would have overthrown the dynasty; for that Eliakim (Isa. 22:20) was a member of the Davidic dynasty is almost certainly excluded by the wording of vss. 22 f. Certainly,

when the writer of II Kings 21:16 mentioned the "innocent blood," he had a good opportunity to speak of any reaction against the shedding of it. But while such a reaction is reported in the history of the house of Ahab, there is no mention of it in the history of Manasseh. Consequently we have no right to regard a text which simply tells of a son of Hilkiah, on whose shoulders the key of the house of David was laid that he might open and close as master of the palace (see I Chron. 9:27), as the programme of a revolution against Manasseh.

As I review the entire argument at the close of this critical discussion, my final judgment can only be this: That the difficulties inherent in the present connection of the sentences in Isa. 22:15-18, 20 ff., and 36:3, are not as great as those which are inherent in the interpretation which Professor Fullerton has advocated with so much vivacity and skill.